



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The only passage in which Mr. Fennell attacks my English is in his note on O 11 73 (81), *παραιθυζε*, and for this generosity I am duly grateful. One of my English critics said that my style was not very scholarly, but failed to particularize; another found fault with my use of 'aloofness,' but that was before the publication of AL in the Oxford Dictionary; another thought 'saliency' a horrid word,¹ and a chorus of indolent reviewers lifted up their ineffectual heels against the expression (Introductory Essay, xxxiii) 'an arrangement in God and Blood.' Was I to refer in a footnote to Mrs. Waterbrook in David Copperfield and to inform the world that I purposely made my phrase as crude as Pindar's youthful creed? So here Mr. Fennell tells me that 'flashing sound' is un-English. For that matter, *παραιθυζε* as Pindar uses it is un-Greek, and by 'flashing sound' I intended to indicate the unwonted transfer from sight to sound. And after all, is 'flashing sound' any more unjustifiable than 'flashes of silence'—a *mot* that was successful in its day?

But I do not care to follow Mr. Fennell through all the passages—there are some scores—in which he arraigns the interpretations that I have accepted from others or haply struck out for myself. A reply to criticisms is apt to be sharper than the criticisms themselves, and what scholarly criticisms are, we can learn from Mr. Fennell himself. "The ill-natured criticisms and controversies of athletes," says Mr. Fennell in his Introduction to Ol. IX, "are now endless and probably have always been so. Scholarship, however, cannot in this particular vaunt itself over gymnastic." Perhaps there is a twinge of repentance discernible in this passing remark. At all events, I will not let Mr. Fennell's somewhat blunt expression of differences in details of interpretation interfere with my satisfaction at his approval of my general treatment of Pindaric composition; and in my hearty recognition of the services rendered to the study of Pindar by this new edition, to which I hope to return, I shall not be disturbed by the epithets 'idle,' 'rash,' 'fanciful,' 'far-fetched' and 'unsound' which he has bestowed on my exegesis. He who hears nothing worse from his brethren of the philological guild may count himself lucky. *θεὸς εἰη ἀπήμων κέαρ*, says the youthful Pindar, with an optative he might have learned from Hesiod. *ἐν δ' ὀλίγῳ βροτῶν τὸ τερπνὸν αὔξεται*, says Pindar, the aged.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

Der deutsche Satzbau, dargestellt von HERMANN WUNDERLICH. Stuttgart, 1892.

Believing that science ought, from time to time, to give an account of its progress to the general public, the author attempts a practical application of the latest detailed work in Germanics, in which he deals primarily with the sentence-structure of the modern period of the German language. He certainly deserves to be commended for his observance of the element of proportion, in keeping his historical foundation visible merely, instead of building it up so high as to be mistaken for the edifice itself. The student of German will realize that a work such as the one before us, however well

¹"[The] pungent sayings [of W. H. Thompson] acquired their fame as much from the prominence of his position as from their own *saliency*."—C. Merivale in [English] *Journal of Philology*, XV 307.

executed, can be but temporary—resting, as it were, on such a foundation as detailed investigation has thus far been able to provide for it—imperfect in many respects, and scarcely begun on the Low-German side, where a well-developed syntax still awaits special study.

The work is divided into five chapters, viz. I. Verbs; II. Substantives; III. Adjectives; IV. Pronouns; V. Particles and Prepositions. In Chapter I Wunderlich disapproves of making the sentence synonymous with the logical proposition having a verb expressed or implied, and accepts the theory that the sentence is the primitive form of expression, which may, in the course of its development, be resolved into different parts of speech. Hence he concludes that the verb is not essential to the formation of a sentence. Excluding the infinitive and participles, which he regards as substantive and adjective respectively, he maintains that the verb can form a complete sentence only in the imperative, because in all other cases some substantive is required, and may be omitted only for stylistic effect.

In opposition to Erdmann, he rightly defends the native origin of the historical present, which he explains on psychological grounds, instead of ascribing it entirely to classical influence. In explanation of the double infinitive in compound tenses, he says (p. 53) that the real auxiliary verbs, which were properly preterit presents, were originally not employed in compound tenses. "Die eigentlichen Hilfsverba sind Praeterito-praesentia; vielleicht dass sie deshalb sich nicht dazu eigneten, *alleinige* Träger der Zeitanschauung zu werden, vielleicht auch mehr darum dass ihr Verbalgehalt dünner war als der von Verben wie hören und sehen. Jedenfalls ist der Unterschied da." Examples: (1) *wold in hân gehôret* and (2) *ich hân des hoeren jehen*. "Die alte Sprache hatte die Perfektumschreibung am Verbum finitum durchgeführt (example 1), indem sie das Hilfsverb nur einfach in das Praeteritum kleidete." The compound tenses, he says, were first employed in the case of those auxiliaries that were not preterit presents, viz. *hören, sehen, lassen* and *heissen*, whose infinitive and perfect participle coincided in form, except *hören*, which he would explain by analogy to *sehen*. The prefix *ge* is then dropped by assimilation to the infinitive. This explanation is certainly a very ingenious one, and marks a decided advance in the solution of one of the most difficult problems in German grammar. One would like, however, to see statistical evidence produced for the influence of *sehen* on *hören*.

Wunderlich's theory of the 'excipiendo Nebensatz' seems somewhat artificial and forced. On pp. 70-1 he says: "Meist ist diese unerlässliche Bedingung jedoch kein Ereignis das gewünscht wird, sondern im Gegenteil eines das gefürchtet wird, und deshalb bricht in den meisten Belegen die Negationspartikel als Ausfluss negativer Willenskraft durch (Tristan, *es enirre mich der tôt*), bis sie konventionell auch in Fügungen herübergenommen wurde mit denen sie nichts zu schaffen hatte, so in Handschrift A des Armen Heinrich, *got enwelle der arzât wesen*." In sum and substance he asserts that the reading of MS B of the Armer Heinrich—*got welle dan der arzât wesen*—is the original idiom, while the negative in MS A has been introduced secondarily by analogy to those cases where the particle *ne* is an *Ausfluss negativer Willenskraft* effected by fear. The passages cited by the author do not indicate whether he has established his theory by statistical evidence. Nor

does he prove that the idiom in B is older than the one in A. Moreover, Middle High German examples will not suffice, for the Old High German is really indispensable here. But in Old High German we find the particle *ne* even in those *excipiendo Nebensätze* where there is no likelihood of its being due to the will of the speaker actuated by fear lest the statement be fulfilled. Erdmann's theory that *ne* here is the rule, while its loss in Middle High German is a secondary development, is much more probable. To fortify his statement, Wunderlich would have to give examples of the Old High German *excipiendo Nebensatz* without *ne* and not denoting fear on the part of the speaker, that are used at an earlier date, or at least not later than those with *ne*.

Eighteen pages of the work before us are devoted to the position of the verb in the sentence, and especially in the dependent clause. Wackernagel (Idg. Forschungen, I 333 ff.) believes that the actual difference between the principal and subordinate clause lies in the stress on the verb, and since the verb of the independent clause receives little stress, it gravitates toward a position immediately following the first word of the clause, where the intonation is weak. On the other hand, in the dependent clause, where the verb is stressed, it gravitates to the end, a more prominent position. From this theory Wunderlich justly demands a conclusive proof for the existence of this system of accent in case of German, where the Nebensatz follows the Hauptsatz instead of preceding it, as in Old Indian. He also insists on an explanation of this peculiar verb-stress, without which we have a mere *petitio principii* before us. On pp. 91, 92, 194 our author advances the following theory of his own: "Am Hauptsatz arbeiteten Bewusstsein und Sprache fast gleichzeitig; beim Nebensatz geht das erstere der zweiten vorher; d. h. der Hauptsatz baut sich in einzelnen Momenten auf, der Nebensatz schiebt nach Steintal abgeschlossene Vorstellungsreihen dazwischen, mit denen der Hauptsatz als mit einer Einheit operirt. Schon hieraus ergibt sich die veränderte Rolle die das Verbum im Haupt- und Nebensatze spielt: im ersten ist es einfach ein Moment wie andere auch, das je nach den Umständen in der Stellung mit den andern wechselt, im Nebensatze aber ist es der Träger des Einheitsgedankens, die Unterlage aller Bestimmungen, die deshalb auch nach einem deutschen Gesetz . . . die Reihe schliesst. 1. Composita haben den Hauptbestandteil am Ende. 2. Periphrastische Conjugation hat den Träger der Bestimmung am Ende. 3. Attribut vor dem Substantiv." He does not show why the verb is of such primary importance in the dependent clause, nor does he reconcile his acceptance of the paramount importance of the verb here with the statement that the verb is not essential to sentence-formation. Again, it is an open question whether every dependent clause need be a premeditated and finished unit. Must Bewusstsein precede Sprache in the dependent clause? If we should suddenly ask a bystander who a certain person in front of us is, and point out some peculiarity by way of supplementing our question, that peculiarity may occur to us only after having put the question, when we realize that a further description is necessary. Such a dependent clause would not be a preconceived unit.¹ Now, is it not dogmatic

¹ The following illustration crossed my track while I was reading Mr. Ferren's review:

Who's yonder,
That does appear as if he were flay'd? O gods!
He has the stamp of Marc'us: and I have
Before-time seen him thus.—Sh., Cor. 1, 6.

—B. L. G.

to speak of the dependent clause as '*eine abgeschlossene Einheit*' when so many of them contain afterthoughts and descriptions formed in the mind of the speaker at the moment when he has just uttered the principal clause?

The two sections on 'Endstellung des Verbums im Hauptsatz' and 'Die Normaltypen des Hauptsatzes' agree in substance with Erdmann's last chapter. W. believes that an appositive noun has a tendency in German to become independent.

The section on the article shows the influence of Binz's review of Wunderlich's former work, 'Zur Syntax Luthers.' While the development of the definite article is very clearly presented, somewhat too much stress is laid on its importance as a 'Geschlechts- und Flexionswort,' and not enough on its actual function as an article, called by Erdmann 'Kennzeichnung des Individuums.' The influence of the definite article as producing changes in gender seems to have been largely overestimated, especially in case of such Low German masculines as became feminine in High German. In treating the indefinite article W. pays no attention to the intensive meaning of *ein* (= Eng. *unique*) in Middle High German.

On p. 146 he explains the double accusative with verbs like *lehren* as the subject and object accusative respectively of an implied infinitive. This smacks of class-room parsing. As for the development of the factitive predicate, he tells us that the constructions with and without a preposition were both common in Luther's language.

The grammatical subject *es*, according to Wunderlich, p. 180, originated from a neuter *object* pronoun which stood for a following *object* clause. "Wenn nun ein solches *es* vor *Subjectivsätze* trat war der Anstoss zu einem Vorläufer des Subjectes gegeben, vor allem in Sätzen wie *es ist unrichtig, dass; es ist ein Gerücht, dass; es geht ein Gerücht, dass,*" which (to follow up this line of argument) may in turn give rise to the further analogy *es steht ein Mann draussen*, where no *dass*-clause follows. The explanation is certainly very ingenious and more plausible than either Erdmann's or Grimm's.

W. calls attention to the fact that Luther preferred the stronger and fuller form of the demonstrative pronoun, without, however, excluding the other. In the relative clause of Luther he notices two important items: "1. Eindringen des Pronomens hinter denjenigen der ersten und zweiten Person. *Ich bin das lebendige Brot, ich do nidersteige vom Himmel*; later, *der ich vom hymel bin abgestiegen*. 2. Verdrängung des Demonstrativum durch das Indefinitum *welcher* beginnt . . . (ist aber) bei Luther fast nur in Anlehnung an Nomina verbreitet." In relative clauses Luther generally requires a demonstrative pronoun, and only rarely omits it, as English may do to-day, viz. *den ersten Fisch du siehst*. Wunderlich's chapter on the particles shows good philosophical reasoning with special reference to development. It is still an open question, however, whether *denn* and *dann* are masculine accusative forms corresponding to the neuter *das* (cf. also Behaghel's review of the present work in the *Literaturbl. f. Germ. u. Rom. Phil.*).

In conclusion it may be said that Wunderlich's book deserves a cordial welcome on the part of German scholars. It is especially valuable on account of the emphasis it lays on the period of Luther, a period hitherto sadly neglected. As for the examples quoted, Middle High German is well repre-

sented, while Middle Low German, on the other hand, is entirely disregarded. Rather too many examples are taken from the 18th-century literature and hardly enough from the present period.

Wunderlich is more philosophical and purely theoretical than Erdmann, who deals more with historical detail. While many of Erdmann's statements are better adapted to practical application, Wunderlich is much happier in his psychological reasoning. Our author has certainly done a great deal of collateral reading, and his work gives evidence of considerable originality, which we are the more ready to concede when we consider how scrupulous he has been in acknowledging his obligations to others.

The present volume shows that the author is thoroughly in touch with modern scholarship, and that he knows how to profit by the reviews of his earlier works, in carefully avoiding a repetition of mistakes made in the past.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY M. FERREN.